

## REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 18-20, as well as newly added Claims 28-35, the only claims pending and currently under examination in this application.

### Formal Matters

Claims 18 and 20 have been amended to specify that at least one polymer on the surface is protected by a protective bubble. Support for this amendment is found in the claims as originally filed. Claims 28- 35 have been added. Support for new Claims 28-35 is found in the claims as originally filed. As the above amendments introduce no new matter to the application, their entry is respectfully requested.

### Rejection under 45 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.C.S. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ribi et al. (US Patent No. 5,491,097). In view of the amendments to the claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 to 20 have been amended to recite that at least one of the polymers on the substrate surface is "selectively protected from reaction by a protective bubble." Nowhere does Ribi et al. disclose a substrate having a surface on which a polymer is selectively protected from reaction by the presence of a protective bubble. Accordingly, since the cited reference does not disclose each and every limitation of the present invention, it fails to anticipate Claims 18-20.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.C.S. §102(b) over Ribi et al. (US Patent No. 5,491,097) may be withdrawn.

Claims 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.C.S. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Heller et al. (US Patent No. 5,605,662). In view of the amendments to the claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 to 20 have been amended to recite that at least one of the polymers on the substrate surface is "selectively protected from reaction by a protective bubble." Nowhere does Heller et al. disclose a substrate having a surface on which a polymer is selectively protected from reaction by the presence of a protective bubble. Accordingly, since the cited reference does not disclose each and every limitation of the present invention, it fails to anticipate Claims 18-20.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.C.S. §102(b) over Heller et al. (US Patent No. 5,605,662) may be withdrawn.

Claims 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.C.S. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Hollis et al. (US Patent No. 5,653,939). In view of the amendments to the claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 to 20 have been amended to recite that at least one of the polymers on the substrate surface is "selectively protected from reaction by a protective bubble." Nowhere does Hollis et al. disclose a substrate having a surface on which a polymer is selectively protected from reaction by the presence of a protective bubble. Accordingly, since the cited reference does not disclose each and every limitation of the present invention, it fails to anticipate Claims 18-20.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.C.S. §102(b) over Hollis et al. (US Patent No. 5,653,939) may be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: April 27, 2004

By:

Bret E. Field  
Registration No. 37,620